Educational Task Force Focus Group on Quality Teaching & Schools

Documentation supporting proposed ideas for consideration:

1. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: *Educational Leadership*: Joe Nathan: ***Small Schools: The Benefits of Sharing***. (2002)

   On Smaller Schools: "Throughout the United States, educators and parents are creating small schools by partnering with the community and sharing facilities…The results are encouraging: improvement student achievement, higher graduation rates, and better faculty morale."

2. Bank Street College: ***Small Schools: Great Strides***. (1997)
   On Small Schools: "Student attachment, persistence and performance are stronger in small schools.. Student in these schools have better attendance rates, significantly lower dropout rates, and higher grade point averages than do students in larger schools. They also fail fewer courses and demonstrate increased persistence in progress toward graduation. In small elementary schools, fewer students are retained in the same grade than in their larger schools."

3. Civic Forum: ***Holomua Kakou*** (Summer 2002*)*
   On Systems: "It is important to think of the educational system holistically from preschool through the university."

   On the Complex: "Using the complex level as a conduit, with authority for school policies and decision-making at the school-community level, provides for a natural flow of two-way sharing. The complex provides a channel for continuity, K-12. It makes it possible for ideas, questions and issues to be more widely shared and deliberated. It provides opportunities for assessment on a wider range to determine what is working, what isn't working, and to explore ideas and make modifications."

4. Hawaii Educational Policy Center: ***Governance and the Size of Systems, Districts and Schools*** [Informal briefing paper] (2002):

   Perspectives. The following data places Hawaii in a national perspective in terms of size: (US DOE, National Center for Education Statistics: Statistical Analysis Report, *Overview of Public Elementary and Secondary School and Districts: School Year 1999-2000*, August 2001)
   School Size:
   Average # of Students per primary school: National – 466; Hawaii – 576.
   Average # of Students per middle school: National – 595; Hawaii – 836.
   Average # of Students per high school: National – 752; Hawaii – 1,468.

   % schools with less than 300 students: National – 30.1%; Hawaii – 9.9%.
   % schools with 300-749 students: National – 49.4%; Hawaii – 51.4%.
   % schools with 750-1499 students: National – 15.8%; Hawaii – 31.8%.
   % schools with 1500+ students: National – 3.5%; Hawaii – 7.1%

   % students in schools with less than 300: National – 9.1%; Hawaii – 2.3%

% students in schools with 300-749: **National – 47.1%; Hawaii – 36.9%**
% students in schools with 750-1499: **National – 29.9%; Hawaii – 41.7%**
% students in school with 1500+: **National – 13.9%; Hawaii – 19.0%**

Student/Teacher Ratio:
Median Student/Teacher ratio for primary school: National – 16.2; Hawaii – 17.5.
Median Student/Teacher ratio for middle school: National – 15.5; Hawaii – 17.0
Median Student/Teacher ratio for high school: National – 14.8; Hawaii – 17.5

5. HSTA Task Force: ***Schools for the 21st Century*** (1994)
   On The School Day: "The Way we use and think about time may be the greatest obstacle to educational change…The present classroom schedule does not provide time for teachers' professional duties outside the classroom…"
   On a coherent & stable curriculum: "Consistency and continuity are critical to effective change…The education pendulum has swung too many times. Teachers, parents, and students need to be assured they won't be abandoned in mid-program."

6. National Association of Secondary Principals: ***Breaking Ranks: Changing An American Institution.*** (5th printing, 2001)

   On smaller high schools: High schools will create small units in which anonymity is banished…As a first order of business, each high school should try to limit its enrollment to self-operating units of no more than 600 students. Achieving this objective need not bean assuming the expense of constructing new buildings. Smallness of scale can be created in many ways, even in a structure built to accommodate a large enrollment. House plans and cluster program, for example, group students into smaller, more intimate units. Such approaches seek to reduce the number of teachers and other students with whom a student comes in contact each day. An organizational approach that produces some kind of school-within-a-school moves toward combating the bigness that shrouds so many youngsters in a cloak of anonymity. 'The overwhelming weight of research studies confirm beneficial effects for small high school size and detrimental effects for large high school size, concludes a study…'"

   On the School Schedule, the School Day and the School Year: "High schools must examine the basic assumptions about time under which they have long operated – the length of the class period, the length of the school day, and the length of the school year."

   On a more integrated, multi-disciplinary team teaching model: "They should encourage faculty members to pursue close associations with colleagues in other disciplines…In a high school with a house plan or one that uses schools-within-a-school, teachers …could also purse colleagueship with those who employ a similar pedagogy…"

7. National Committee on Teaching and America's Future: Hawaii Policy Group: ***The Magic Weavers: Securing The Future for Hawaii's Children***. (2001)

   On the Complex-level approach: "Support structural organization of schools around complexes to coordinate students' K-12 continuum of education and the delivery of services to schools."

8. Pacific-Asian Education: ***Teachers Teams: The Key to Success in a Large Secondary School***. (March 1991)

   On the Castle High School Experiment with teaching teams: [Comparing a standard, or control group vs. a "core" that were taught by a team.] "Only seven percent of the students in the core team had ten or more absences per quarter, as compared to twenty-three percent for the control group. …Thirty-three percent of the core team students were rated exemplary [in academic performance] compared with eighteen percent in the control. Thirty-four percent of the core team students were rated below standard, compared with fifty-six percent in the control…Teams incorporated such strategies as consistent and fair management of students; teachers as advisers; close student monitoring; coordinated homework, test, and project scheduling; a challenging curriculum; and a continuous flow of information to students and parents."